

## REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Final Office Action dated November 19, 2007, in which the Examiner objected to the specification, objected to claims 1-7, 9-11, and 19, rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11 and 19 as anticipated by Baugh et al. (US 7128146) and indicated that claims 2-4 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection and in independent form. Claims 8, 12-18, and 20 were indicated to be allowable.

### Objection to the Specification

In response to the objection, the inconsistent use of reference numeral "42" in the text has been deleted. Applicant respectfully submits that the deletion is appropriate because 1) no corresponding use of the reference numeral 42 appears in the Figures; and 2) the specification is clear even without the reference numeral, as the specification refers to "a small annular space" which "will occur between the frustoconical portion 2c of the expander body 2, and the inner surface of the expanded transition zone 40c of the tubular element 40." Because the items defining the annular space are identified, Applicant submits that a reference numeral designating the space itself is not necessary.

### Claims indicated to be allowable

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his further consideration of the claims.

As discussed in detail below, claim 2 has been placed in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 1 from which it formerly depended.

Claims 3, 4, and 7 depend from allowable claim 2 and are therefore also allowable.

Claims 5, 9, and 19 have been re-written to depend from allowable claim 2 instead of claim 1. Claims 5, 9, and 19 are therefore also allowable, along with claims 6, 10, and 11, which depend from them.

### Amendment to Claim 2

Claim 2 has been re-written in independent form, incorporating the limitations of former claim 1, which has been canceled. However, the Examiner will note that certain language from former claim 1 has not been copied into amended claim 2. Specifically, the final four lines of

former claim 1, which read "*and wherein the expander is arranged in the tubular element, the expander being in the radially retracted mode thereof, and wherein said contact section is in contact with the inner surface of the tubular element so as to prevent axial movement of the expander through the unexpanded portion of the tubular element*" has been omitted because it appears to be redundant.

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the amendments that have been made to claim 1, the omission of this redundant text makes the claim clearer without altering the scope of the claim. Nonetheless, if the Examiner disagrees, Applicant is willing to re-instate the text. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that the text in question can be restored expeditiously.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration by the Examiner is requested. Should the Examiner find any impediment to the prompt allowance of the claims that can be corrected by telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
LOHBECK, Wilhelmus Christianus Maria

P.O. Box 2463  
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

/Marcella D. Watkins/  
Patent Agent, Marcella D. Watkins  
Reg. No. 36,962  
(713) 241-1041